arXiv:1510.05081v1 [math.AP] 17 Oct 2015

CHARACTERISTIC FUNCTIONS ON THE BOUNDARY OF A PLANAR DOMAIN NEED NOT BE TRACES OF LEAST GRADIENT FUNCTIONS

MICKAËL DOS SANTOS

Abstract. Given a smooth bounded planar domain, we construct a compact set on the boundary s.t. its characteristic function is not the trace of a least gradient function. This generalize the construction of Spradlin and Tamasan [ST14] on the disc.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Strategy of the proof 2
2.1. The model problem 2
2.2. Comments 4
3. Notations, definitions 4
4. Construction of the Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$ 5
4.1. First step: main hypotheses 5
4.2. Step 2: Iterative construction 5
5. Construction of a sequence of functions used in conjuction with Coarea Formula 7
6. Basic properties for B_∞ and Ψ_N 9
7. Proof of Theorem 1 10
7.1. Upper bound 10
7.2. Saturation of the upper bound 10
7.3. Transverse argument 12
Appendices 13
Appendix A. Results related with the Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$ 13
A.1. Two preliminary results 13
A.2. Proof of Proposition 12 14
Appendix B. Results related with the set B_∞ 16
Appendix C. Adaptation of a result of Giusti in [Giu84] 17
References 19

1. Introduction

We let Ω be a bounded C^2 domain of $\mathbb{R}^2$. For a function $h \in L^1(\partial\Omega, \mathbb{R})$, the least gradient problem with boundary datum h is the problem:

$$\min\left\{\int_\Omega |Dw| \mid w \in BV(\Omega) \text{ and } \mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w = h\right\}. \tag{1}$$

In the above minimization problem, $BV(\Omega)$ is the space of functions of bounded variation. It is the space of functions $w \in L^1(\Omega)$ having a distributional gradient Dw which is a bounded Radon measure.

If the minimization problem (1) admits solutions, such minimal functions are called *functions of least gradient*.

Sternberg, Williams and Ziemmer proved in [SWZ92] that if $h : \partial\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous map and if $\partial\Omega$ satisfies some geometric properties then Problem (1) admits a unique solution.

On the other hand, Spradlin and Tamasan [ST14] proved that, for the disc $\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,|\, |x| < 1\}$ [the disc satisfies the geometric hypotheses of [SWZ92]], we may find a function $h_0 \in L^1(\partial\Omega)$ which is not continuous

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 26B30, 35J56 .

s.t. Problem (1) has no solution. The function h_0 is the characteristic function of a Cantor set $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{S}^1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,|\, |x| = 1\}$

The goal of this article is to extend the main result of [ST14] for a C^2 bounded open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

We prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded C^2 open set. Then there is a measurable set $\mathcal{K} \subset \partial\Omega$ s.t. the minimization problem*

$$\min\left\{\int_\Omega |Dw| \mid w \in BV(\Omega) \text{ and } \mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}\right\} \tag{2}$$

has no solution.

The above theorem has been proved when $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$ is the unit disk in [ST14].

The calculations in [ST14] are specific to the case $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$. The proof of Theorem 1 relies on new arguments for the construction of the Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$ and in the strategy of the proof.

2. Strategy of the proof

2.1. **The model problem.** We present the strategy developed to prove Theorem 1 by proving its adaptation for $\Omega =]0,1[^2$. Obviously this model case does not satisfy the hypothesis of regularity on Ω but it allows to make simple calculations.

We thus prove the following result:

Theorem 2. *Let $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ be a fat Cantor set [e.g. a Smith-Volterra-Cantor set] supported in $\left[\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}\right]$, then letting $\mathcal{K} = \tilde{\mathcal{K}} \times \{0\}$, Problem (2) does not admit a solution.*

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2. The proof is done arguing by contradiction. We assume that there exists u_0 a solution of Problem (2). We obtain a contradiction in 3 Steps.

Step 1. Upper bound
Using a result in [Giu84] [Theorem 2.16 & Remark 2.17] we have

$$\min\left\{\int_\Omega |Dw| \mid w \in BV(\Omega) \text{ and } \mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w = h\right\} = \int_\Omega |Du_0| \leq \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}\|_{L^1(\partial\Omega)} = |\mathcal{K}|. \tag{3}$$

Here $|\mathcal{K}|$ is the length of $\mathcal{K}$.

Estimate (3) follows from Theorem 2.16 & Remark 2.17 in [Giu84]. By combining Theorem 2.16 & Remark 2.17 in [Giu84] we may prove that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a map $u_\varepsilon \in BV(\Omega)$ s.t.

$$\int_\Omega |Du_\varepsilon| \leq (1+\varepsilon)\|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}\|_{L^1(\partial\Omega)} \text{ and } \mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_\varepsilon = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}.$$

The proof of this argument is presented in [Giu84] in a special context [1] . The adaptation for Ω a C^2 set is presented Appendix C. An easy adaptation of the argument may be done for $\Omega =]0,1[^2$.

Step 2. Saturation of (3) [see (6)]
We fix $(u_n)_n \subset C^\infty(\Omega) \cap BV(\Omega)$ s.t. $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_n = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and $u_n \to u_0$ in BV-norm, *i.e.*,

$$u_n \overset{L^1}{\to} u_0 \text{ and } \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| \to \int_\Omega |Du_0|.$$

The sequence is defined by convolution with u_0 and a Friedrichs mollifiers with compact support [see [Giu84]-Theorem 1.17].

We let also $B_\infty := \{(x,y) \in]0,1[^2 \,|\, x \in \tilde{\mathcal{K}} \text{ and } y > 0\}$. The saturation of (3) consists in obtaining:

$$\int_{B_\infty} |\partial_2 u_n| \geq |\mathcal{K}|. \tag{4}$$

[1] This result was initially proved by Gagliardo in [Gag57]. A short proof of "$\mathrm{tr} W^{1,1} = L^1$" may be found in [Mir15]. The key-point is here the quantitative form of the upper bound on $\int_\Omega |Du_\varepsilon|$ given by Remark 2.17 in [Giu84].

As observed by Mironescu, the key tool in the proof of (4) is Fubini Theorem combined with the Fundamental Theorem of calculus.

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_\infty}|\partial_2 u_n| &= \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\int_0^1 |\partial_2 u_n|\mathbb{1}_{B_\infty}\,\mathrm{d}y \\ &\geq \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\left|\int_0^1 \partial_2 u_n \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty}\mathrm{d}y\right| \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{K}}} \\ &= |\tilde{\mathcal{K}}| = |\mathcal{K}|. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

(6)

Step 3. A transverse argument

In order to obtain a contradiction we are going to prove that [for sufficiently large n]

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| - \int_{B_\infty}|\partial_2 u_n| \geq \delta \text{ for some } \delta>0 \text{ independent of } n. \tag{7}$$

From the BV-convergence we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |Du_0| &= \lim_n \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| \\ &= \lim_n \int_{B_\infty}|\partial_2 u_n| + \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| - \int_{B_\infty}|\partial_2 u_n|\right) \\ [(6)\&(7)] &\geq |\mathcal{K}| + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

The last estimate yields a contradiction with (3).

Thus it suffices to prove (7).

We make the following dichotomy: $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ in $\Omega\setminus B_\infty$ or $u_0\equiv 0$ in $\Omega\setminus B_\infty$.

If $u_0\not\equiv 0$ in $\Omega\setminus B_\infty$, since $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega\setminus\mathcal{K}}u_0 = 0$, then u_0 can not be a constant in $\Omega\setminus B_\infty$. Thus

$$\delta := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Omega\setminus B_\infty}|Du_0| > 0.$$

Therefore, for sufficiently large n,

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| - \int_{B_\infty}|\partial_2 u_n| \geq \int_{\Omega\setminus B_\infty}|\nabla u_n| \geq \delta.$$

This prove Estimate (7).

We now assume that $u_0\equiv 0$ in $\Omega\setminus B_\infty$. It is clear that we may fix $\frac{1}{4} < a < b < \frac{3}{4}$ and $0<c<d<1$ s.t.

$$\delta' := \frac{1}{2}\int_{]a,b[\times]c,d[}|u_0| > 0 \text{ and } (\{a,b\}\times]0,1[)\cap B_\infty = \emptyset.$$

Noting that $u_0\equiv 0$ in $\Omega\setminus B_\infty$ and that the sequence $(u_n)_n$ is obtained by the convolution of u with a C^∞-mollifier with compact support, it follows that for sufficiently large n we have $u_n\equiv 0$ in $\{a,b\}\times[c,d]$.

Consequently, from Lemma 3.2 in [ST14], we get [for sufficiently large n]

$$\int_{]a,b[\times]c,d[}|\partial_1 u_n| \geq \frac{2}{b-a}\int_{]a,b[\times]c,d[}|u_n| > \delta'.$$

Since $\int_{]a,b[\times]c,d[}|\partial_1 u_n| > \delta'$, $\int_{]a,b[\times]c,d[}|\partial_2 u_n| \leq 2|\mathcal{K}|$, by Lemma 3.3 in [ST14] we obtained:

$$\int_{]a,b[\times]c,d[}|\nabla u_n| \geq \int_{]a,b[\times]c,d[}|\partial_2 u_n| + \frac{\delta'^2}{4|\mathcal{K}|+\delta'}.$$

We thus get (7) with $\delta := \dfrac{\delta'^2}{4|\mathcal{K}|+\delta'}$.

2.2. **Comments.** To prove Theorem 1, we plan to follow the strategy presented above. The first main step in this strategy is the construction of a suitable Cantor set $\mathcal{K} \subset \partial\Omega$. Once $\mathcal{K}$ is constructed we define B_∞ by bending lines orthogonal to $\partial\Omega$.

The construction of $\mathcal{K}$ is done Section 4 and B_∞ is defined Section 5.

A second main step is to implementing the appropriate substitute of Fubini Theorem. This involves Coarea formula. The estimate we will device [the analog of (6) is done by Lemma 8] is obtained asymptotically by integration [*via* Coarea formula] along level sets of an appropriate function. The appropriate function is, roughly speaking, the projection on $\mathcal{K}$ "along" connected components of B_∞.

The plan of this article is the following:

- In Section 3 we specify some notations and defintions.
- In Section 4 we present the construction of the set $\mathcal{K} \subset \partial\Omega$.
- In Section 5 we construct the fundamental tool in the proof of Theorem 1. The Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$ is obtained by a standard iterative process. It is defined as the intersection of set $\mathcal{K}_N \subset \partial\Omega$: $\mathcal{K} = \cap_{N\geq 1}\mathcal{K}_N$. In Section 5, for $N \geq 1$, we construct a Lipschitz map Ψ_N defined in a subset of Ω with value in $\mathcal{K}_N$. The main difficulty in this construction is to get a map with a sharp control of its Lipschitz semi-norm (see Lemma 6).
- In Section 6 we state some properties on B_∞ and Ψ_N: the topological interior of B_∞ is empty and we give an upper bound for the Lipschitz semi-norm of Ψ_N (see Lemma 6).
- Section 7 is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 1.
- For the convenience of the reader, the proof of some results are postponed to appendices.
 In Appendix A we prove that the measure of the Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$ is positive.
 Appendix B is dedicated to some technical results about the set B_∞.
 In Appendix C we sketch the proof of Giusti to get the analog of (3).

3. Notations, definitions

The ambient space is the euclidean plan $\mathbb{R}^2$. We let $\mathcal{B}_{\text{can}}$ be the canonical basis of its direction space.

a) The open ball centered at $A \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with radius $r > 0$ is denoted by $B(A, r)$.

b) A vector may be denoted by an arrow when it is defined with its extremities (*e.g.* $\overrightarrow{AB}$), it may be also denoted by a letter in bold font (*e.g.* $\mathbf{u}$) or more simply by a grec letter in normal font (*e.g.* ν).
We let also $|\mathbf{u}|$ be the usual euclidean norm of the vector $\mathbf{u}$.

c) For a vector $\mathbf{u}$ we let $\mathbf{u}^\perp$ be the direct orthogonal vector to $\mathbf{u}$, *i.e.*, if the coordinates of $\mathbf{u}$ are (x_1, x_2), then those of $\mathbf{u}^\perp$ are $(-x_2, x_1)$.

d) For $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the segment of extremities A and B is denoted by $[AB] = \{A + t\overrightarrow{AB} \,|\, t \in [0,1]\}$ and $\text{dist}(A, B) = |\overrightarrow{AB}|$ is the usual euclidean distance.

e) For a set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, the topological interior of U is denoted by $\overset{\circ}{U}$ and its topological closure is $\overline{U}$.

f) For $k \geq 1$, a C^k-curve is the range of a C^k injective map from $]0,1[$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$. Note that, in this article, C^k-curves are not closed sets of $\mathbb{R}^2$.

g) For Γ a C^1-curve, $\mathscr{H}^1(\Gamma)$ is the 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure of Γ.

h) For $k \geq 1$, a C^k-Jordan curve is the range of a C^k injective map from the unit circle $\mathbb{S}^1$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$.

i) For Γ a C^1-curve or a C^1-Jordan curve, $\mathscr{C} = [AB]$ is a chord of Γ when $A, B \in \overline{\Gamma}$ with $A \neq B$.

j) If Γ is a C^1-Jordan curve then, for $A, B \in \Gamma \,\&\, A \neq B$, the set $\Gamma \setminus \{A, B\}$ admits exactly two connected components: $\Gamma_1 \& \Gamma_2$. These connected components are C^1-curves.

By smoothness of Γ, it is clear that there is $\eta_\Gamma > 0$ s.t. for $0 < \text{dist}(A, B) < \eta_\Gamma$ there exists THE smallest connected components: we have $\mathscr{H}^1(\Gamma_1) < \mathscr{H}^1(\Gamma_2)$ or $\mathscr{H}^1(\Gamma_2) < \mathscr{H}^1(\Gamma_1)$.

If $0 < \text{dist}(A, B) < \eta_\Gamma$ we may define $\widehat{AB}$ by:

$$\widehat{AB} \text{ is the closure of the smallest curve between } \Gamma_1 \text{ and } \Gamma_2. \tag{8}$$

k) In this article $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a C^2 bounded open set. By C^2 we mean that $\partial\Omega$ is of class C^2:
- There exists a covering $\{U_1, ..., U_n\}$ of $\partial\Omega$ by open sets, $\partial\Omega \subset \cup_{i=1}^n U_i$,
- For all $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ there is a C^2 diffeomorphism $\varphi_i : \overline{U_i} \to \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ s.t.

$$\left| \begin{array}{l} \varphi_i(U_i \cap \Omega) = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{D} \,|\, x_2 > 0\} \\ \varphi_i(U_i \cap \partial\Omega) = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{D} \,|\, x_2 = 0\} \end{array} \right. .$$

4. Construction of the Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$

It is clear that, up to consider a connected component of Ω, in order to prove Theorem 1 we may assume that Ω is a connected set.

We fix $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded C^2 open connected set. The set $\mathcal{K} \subset \partial\Omega$ of Theorem 1 is a Cantor set. It is constructed by a recursive way.

4.1. **First step: main hypotheses.** From the regularity of Ω, there are $\ell + 1$ C^2-open sets, $\omega_0, ..., \omega_\ell$, s.t. $\Omega = \omega_0 \setminus \overline{\omega_1 \cup \cdots \cup \omega_\ell}$.

Moreover we may assume that:

- ω_i is simply connected for $i = 0, ..., \ell$,
- $\overline{\omega_i} \subset \omega_0$ for $i = 1, ..., \ell$,
- $\overline{\omega_i} \cap \overline{\omega_j} = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$.

We let $\Gamma = \partial\omega_0$. The Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$ is constructed in Γ. Note that Γ is a Jordan-curve. From the Gauss-Bonnet Theorem we get the existence of $M_0 \in \Gamma$ and $r_0 \in]0, 1[$ s.t. for $A, B \in B(M_0, r_0) \cap \Gamma$, the chord $[AB] \subset \overline{\Omega}$ and $[AB] \cap \partial\Omega = \{A, B\}$. Note that we may assume $2r_0 < \eta_\Gamma$ [η_Γ is defined in Section 3-j]

We fix $A, B \in B(M_0, r_0) \cap \Gamma$ s.t. $A \neq B$. We have:

- By the definition of M_0 and r_0, the chord $\mathscr{C}_0 := [AB]$ is included in $\overline{\Omega}$.
- We let $\widehat{AB}$ be the closure of the smallest part of Γ which is delimited by A, B (see (8)). Up to replace r_0 by a smaller value we may assume that $\widehat{AB}$ is the graph of $f \in C^2([0, \eta], \mathbb{R}^+)$ in the orthonormal frame $\mathcal{R}_0 = (A, \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$ where $\mathbf{e}_1 = \overrightarrow{AB}/|\overrightarrow{AB}|$.
- The function f is strictly concave and $f(x) > 0$ for $x \in]0, \eta[$.

Key Claim. Note that the length of the chord $[AB]$ is η and that for intervals $I, J \subset [0, \eta]$, if $I \subset J$ then

$$\|f''_{|I}\|_{L^\infty(I)} \leq \|f''_{|J}\|_{L^\infty(J)} \tag{9}$$

where $f_{|I}$ is the restriction of f to I.

Thus, up to replace the chord $\mathscr{C}_0 = [AB]$ by a smaller chord of $\widehat{AB}$ parallel to $\mathscr{C}_0$, and up to restrict the function f (and up to add a suitable constant to f) we may assume that

$$0 < \eta < \min\left\{\frac{1}{2}\,;\, \frac{1}{16\|f''\|^2_{L^\infty([0,\eta])}}\right\}. \tag{10}$$

We may also assume that

- Letting D_0^+ be the bounded open set s.t. $\partial D_0^+ = [AB] \cup \widehat{AB}$ we have $\Pi_{\partial\Omega}$, the orthogonal projection on $\partial\Omega$, which is well defined and of class C^2 in D_0^+.
- Once again by (9) we have

$$1 + 4\|f''\|^2_{L^\infty} \mathrm{diam}(D_0^+) < \frac{16}{9} \tag{11}$$

 where $\mathrm{diam}(D_0^+) = \sup\{\mathrm{dist}(M, N) \,|\, M, N \in D_0^+\}$.

4.2. **Step 2: Iterative construction.** We are now in position to construct the Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$ as a subset of $\widehat{AB}$. The construction is iterative.

The goal of the construction is to get at Step $N \geq 0$ a collection of 2^N pairwise disjoint curves included in $\widehat{AB}$ [denoted by $\{K_1^N, ..., K_{2^N}^N\}$] and their chords [denoted by $\{\mathscr{C}_1^N, ..., \mathscr{C}_{2^N}^N\}$].

The idea is standard: at the step $N \geq 0$ we replace a curve Γ_0 included in $\widehat{AB}$ by two curves included in Γ_0 (see Figure 1).

Initialization. We initialize the procedure by letting $K_1^0 := \widehat{AB}$ and $\mathscr{C}_1^0 = \mathscr{C}_0 = [AB]$.

At step $N \geq 0$ we have:

- A set of 2^N curves included in $\widehat{AB}$, $\{K_1^N, ..., K_{2^N}^N\}$. The curves K_k^N's are mutually disjoints. We let $\mathcal{K}_N = \cup_{k=1}^{2^N} K_k^N$.
- A set of 2^N chords, $\{\mathscr{C}_1^N, ..., \mathscr{C}_{2^N}^N\}$ s.t. for $k = 1, ..., 2^N$, $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ is the chord of K_k^N.

Remark 1. (1) Note that since the $\mathscr{C}_k^N$'s are chords of $\widehat{AB}$ and since in the frame $\mathcal{R}_0 = (A, \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$, $\widehat{AB}$ is the graph of a function, none of the chords $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ are vertical, *i.e.*, directed by $\mathbf{e}_2$.

Since the chords $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ are not vertical, for $k \in \{1, ..., 2^N\}$, we may define $\nu_{\mathscr{C}_k^N}$ as the unit vector orthogonal to $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ s.t. $\nu_{\mathscr{C}_k^N} = \alpha \mathbf{e}_1 + \beta \mathbf{e}_2$ with $\beta > 0$.

(2) Since the function $f \in C^2([0, \eta], \mathbb{R}^+)$ is strictly concave, considering a chord $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ and a straight line D perpendicular to $\mathscr{C}_k^N$, the straight line D intersect K_k^N at exactly one points.

This fact may be easily checked by letting Γ^* be the range of $\widehat{AB}$ with respect to the symmetry of axe $[AB]$ and by noting that the compact set delimited by $\widehat{AB} \cup \Gamma^*$ is a strictly convex domain.

Heredity rules. From Step $N \geq 0$ to Step $N+1$ we follow the following rules:

(1) For each $k \in \{1, ..., 2^N\}$, we let η_k^N be the length of $\mathscr{C}_k^N$. Inside the chord $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ we center a segment I_k^N of length $(\eta_k^N)^2$.

(2) With the help of Remark 1.2, we may define two distinct points of K_k^N as the intersection of K_k^N with straight lines perpendicular to $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ which pass by the extremities of I_k^N.

(3) These intersection points are the extremities of a curve $\tilde{K}_k^N$ included in K_k^N. We let K_{2k-1}^{N+1} and K_{2k}^{N+1} the connected components of $K_k^N \setminus \overline{\tilde{K}_k^N}$. We let also
- $\mathscr{C}_{2k-1}^{N+1}$ and $\mathscr{C}_{2k}^{N+1}$ their chords;
- $\mathcal{K}_{N+1} = \cup_{k=1}^{2^{N+1}} K_k^{N+1}$.

Notation 2. A natural terminology consists in defining the father and the sons of a chord or a curve:
- $\mathcal{F}(\mathscr{C}_{2k-1}^{N+1}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathscr{C}_{2k}^{N+1}) = \mathscr{C}_k^N$ is the *father* of the chords $\mathscr{C}_{2k-1}^{N+1}$ and $\mathscr{C}_{2k}^{N+1}$.
 $\mathcal{F}(K_{2k-1}^{N+1}) = \mathcal{F}(K_{2k}^{N+1}) = K_k^N$ is the *father* of the curves K_{2k-1}^{N+1} and K_{2k}^{N+1}.
- $\mathcal{S}(\mathscr{C}_k^N) = \{\mathscr{C}_{2k-1}^{N+1}, \mathscr{C}_{2k}^{N+1}\}$ is the set of sons of the chord $\mathscr{C}_k^N$, *i.e.*, $\mathcal{F}(\mathscr{C}_{2k-1}^{N+1}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathscr{C}_{2k}^{N+1}) = \mathscr{C}_k^N$.
 $\mathcal{S}(K_k^N) = \{K_{2k-1}^{N+1}, K_{2k}^{N+1}\}$ is the set of sons of the curve K_k^N, *i.e.*, $\mathcal{F}(K_{2k-1}^{N+1}) = \mathcal{F}(K_{2k}^{N+1}) = K_k^N$.

The heredity step is represented in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. Heredity

In Figure 2&3 the two first iterations of the process are represented.




FIGURE 2. First iteration of the process




FIGURE 3. Second iteration of the process

We now define the Cantor set

$$\mathcal{K} = \bigcap_{N \geq 0} \overline{\mathcal{K}_N}. \tag{12}$$

The Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$ is fat:

Proposition 3. *We have $\mathscr{H}^1(\mathcal{K}) > 0$.*

This proposition is proved in Appendix A.

5. Construction of a sequence of functions used in conjuction with Coarea Formula

A key argument in the proof of Theorem 1 is the use of the coarea formula to calculate a lower bound for (2). The coarea formula is applied to a function adapted to the set $\mathcal{K}$.

For $N = 0$ we let

- D_0^+ be the compact set delimited by $K_0 = \widehat{AB}$ and $\mathscr{C}_1^0 := [AB]$ the chord of K_0.
- We recall that we fixed a frame $\mathcal{R}_0 = (A, \mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$ where $\mathbf{e}_1 = \overrightarrow{AB}/|\overrightarrow{AB}|$. For $\sigma = (\sigma_1, 0) \in \mathscr{C}_1^0$, we define:

(13) I_σ is the connected component of $\{(\sigma_1, t) \in \Omega \,|\, t \leq 0\}$ which contains σ.

 $[I_\sigma$ is a vertical segment included in $\Omega]$.
- $D_0^- = \cup_{\sigma \in \mathscr{C}_1^0} I_\sigma$.
- We now define the maps

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \tilde{\Psi}_0 : & D_0^- & \to & \mathscr{C}_1^0 \\ & x & \mapsto & \Pi_{\mathscr{C}_1^0}(x) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \Psi_0 : & D_0^- \cup D_0^+ & \to & \mathscr{C}_1^0 \\ & x & \mapsto & \begin{cases} \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) & \text{if } x \in D_0^+ \\ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}[\tilde{\Psi}_0(x)] & \text{if } x \in D_0^- \end{cases} \end{array}$$

where $\Pi_{\partial\Omega}$ is the orthogonal projection on $\partial\Omega$ and $\Pi_{\mathscr{C}_1^0}$ is the orthogonal projection on $\mathscr{C}_1^0$. Note that, in the frame $\mathcal{R}_0$, for $x = (x_1, x_2) \in D_0^-$, we have $\Pi_{\mathscr{C}_1^0}(x) = (x_1, 0)$.

For $N = 1$ and $k \in \{1, 2\}$ we let:

- D_k^1 be the compact set delimited by K_k^1 and $\mathscr{C}_k^1$;
- T_k^1 be the compact right-angled triangle (with its interior) having $\mathscr{C}_k^1$ as side adjacent to the right angle and whose hypothenuse is included in $\mathscr{C}_1^0$;
- H_k^1 be the hypothenuse of T_k^1.

We now define $D_1^- = \tilde{\Psi}_0^{-1}(H_1^1 \cup H_2^1)$, $T_1 = T_1^1 \cup T_2^1$ and $D_1^+ = D_1^1 \cup D_2^1$.

We first consider the map

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \tilde{\Psi}_1 : & T_1 \cup D_1^- & \to & \mathscr{C}_1^1 \cup \mathscr{C}_2^1 \\ & x & \mapsto & \begin{cases} \Pi_{\mathscr{C}_k^1}(x) & \text{if } x \in T_k^1 \\ \Pi_{\mathscr{C}_k^1}[\tilde{\Psi}_0(x)] & \text{if } x \in D_1^- \end{cases} \end{array}.$$

In Appendix B [Proposition 12], it is proved that the triangles T_1^1 and T_2^1 are disjoint. Thus the map $\tilde{\Psi}_1$ is well defined

By projecting $\mathscr{C}_1^1 \cup \mathscr{C}_2^1$ on $\partial\Omega$ we get

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \Psi_1 : & T_1 \cup D_1^- \cup D_1^+ & \to & \mathcal{K}_1 \\ & x & \mapsto & \begin{cases} \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) & \text{if } x \in D_1^+ \\ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}[\tilde{\Psi}_1(x)] & \text{if } x \in T_1 \cup D_1^- \end{cases} \end{array}.$$




FIGURE 4. The sets defined at Step $N = 1$ and the level line [in dash] of Ψ_1 associated to σ

For $N \geq 1$, we first construct $\tilde{\Psi}_{N+1}$ and then Ψ_{N+1} is obtained from $\tilde{\Psi}_{N+1}$ and $\Pi_{\partial\Omega}$.
For $k \in \{1, ..., 2^{N+1}\}$, we let

- D_k^{N+1} be the compact set delimited by K_k^{N+1} and $\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}$ [recall that $\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}$ is the chord associated to K_k^{N+1}] ;
- T_k^{N+1} be the right-angled triangle (with its interior) having $\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}$ as side adjacent to the right angle and whose hypothenuse is included in $\mathcal{F}(\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1})$. Here $\mathcal{F}(\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1})$ is the father of $\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}$ (see Notation 2);
- $H_k^{N+1} \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1})$ be the hypothenuse of T_k^{N+1}.

We denote $T_{N+1} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{2^{N+1}} T_k^{N+1}$, $D_{N+1}^- = \tilde{\Psi}_N^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{2^{N+1}} H_k^{N+1}\right)$ and $D_{N+1}^+ = \bigcup_{k=1}^{2^{N+1}} D_k^{N+1}$.




FIGURE 5. Heredity. The bold lines correspond to the new iteration

Remark 4. It is easy to check that for $N \geq 0$:

(1) $T_{N+1} \subset D_N^+$,
(2) if $x \in \overset{\circ}{T}_N$ then $x \notin T_{N'}$ for $N' \geq N + 1$ [here $T_0 = \emptyset$].

We now define

$$\begin{array}{rccl}\tilde{\Psi}_{N+1}: & T_{N+1}\cup D^-_{N+1} & \to & \cup_{k=1}^{2^{N+1}}\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}\\ & x & \mapsto & \begin{cases}\Pi_{\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}}(x) & \text{if } x\in T_k^{N+1}\\ \Pi_{\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}}[\tilde{\Psi}_N(x)] & \text{if } x\in \tilde{\Psi}_N^{-1}(\cup_{k=1}^{2^{N+1}}H_k^{N+1})\end{cases}\end{array}.$$

In Appendix B [Proposition 12], it is proved that for $N\geq 1$, the triangles T_k^N for $k=1,...,2^N$ are mutually disjoint. Thus the map $\tilde{\Psi}_{N+1}$ is well defined is $\tilde{\Psi}_N$ makes sense.

And, as in the Initialization Step, we get Ψ_{N+1} from $\tilde{\Psi}_{N+1}$ by projecting $\cup_{k=1}^{2^{N+1}}\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}$ on $\partial\Omega$:

$$\begin{array}{rccl}\Psi_{N+1}: & T_{N+1}\cup D^-_{N+1}\cup D^+_{N+1} & \to & \mathcal{K}_{N+1}\\ & x & \mapsto & \begin{cases}\Pi_{\partial\Omega}[\tilde{\Psi}_{N+1}(x)] & \text{if } x\in T_{N+1}\cup D^-_{N+1}\\ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) & \text{if } x\in D^+_{N+1}\end{cases}\end{array}.$$

It is easy to see that $\Psi_{N+1}(T_{N+1}\cup D^-_{N+1}\cup D^+_{N+1})=\mathcal{K}_{N+1}$.

6. Basic properties for B_∞ and Ψ_N

We first state some fundamental claims on the sets $B_N=T_N\cup D_N^+\cup D_N^-$. It is easy to check that for $N\geq 0$ we have $B_{N+1}\subset B_N$ and $\mathcal{K}\subset\partial B_N$. Therefore we may define

$$B_\infty=\cap_{N\geq 0}\overline{B_N}$$

which is compact and it satisfies $\mathcal{K}\subset\partial B_\infty$.

We are going to prove:

Lemma 5. *The interior of B_∞ is empty.*

Proof of Lemma 5. From Proposition 12 in Appendix B combined with Hypothesis (10), we get two fundamental facts:

(1) The triangles T_1^N, ... ,$T_{2^{N+1}}^N$ are mutually disjoint.
(2) We have:

$$\mathscr{H}^1(H_k^{N+1})<\frac{\mathscr{H}^1(\mathcal{F}(\mathscr{C}_k^N))}{2}. \tag{14}$$

For a non empty set $A\subset\mathbb{R}^2$ we let

$$\mathrm{rad}(A)=\sup\{r\geq 0\,|\,\exists\, x\in A \text{ s.t. } \overline{B(x,r)}\subset A\}.$$

Note that the topological interior of A is empty if and only if $\mathrm{rad}(A)=0$.

On the one hand, it is not difficult to check that

$$\mathrm{rad}(B_N)=\mathrm{rad}(B_N\cap D_N^-). \tag{15}$$

On the other hand, using (14) and the Incidence Theorem applied in a recursive way, we get that for $N\geq 1$:

$$\mathrm{rad}(B_{N+1}\cap D^-_{N+1})\leq\frac{\mathrm{rad}(B_N\cap D_N^-)}{2}. \tag{16}$$

Consequently, by combining (15)&(16) we get the existence of $C_0>1$ s.t.

$$\mathrm{rad}(B_N)\leq\frac{C_0}{2^N}. \tag{17}$$

Since $B_\infty=\cap_{N\geq 0}B_N$, from (17) we get that $\mathrm{rad}(B_\infty)=0$. The last estimate implies the expected result. □

We now prove the key estimate for Ψ_N:

Lemma 6. *The function Ψ_N is $(1+o_N(1))$-Lipschitz.*

Proof. The functions $\tilde{\Psi}_N$ are obtained as compositions of orthogonal projections on straight lines and thus are 1-Lipschitz.

The projection $P_N:=\Pi_{\partial\Omega}$ defined in $\overline{D_N^+}$ is $(1+o_N(1))$-Lipschitz. The functions Ψ_N are either the composition of $\tilde{\Psi}_N$ with P_N or $\Psi_N=P_N$. Consequently Ψ_N is $(1+o_N(1))$-Lipschitz. □

7. Proof of Theorem 1

We are now in position to prove Theorem 1. It is clear that we may assume that Ω is a connected set.

The proof of Theorem 1 is done arguing by contradiction. We assume that there exists a map $u_0 \in BV(\Omega)$ which is a solution of (2).

7.1. **Upper bound.** The first step in the demonstration is

$$\int_\Omega |Du_0| \leq \|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}\|_{L^1(\partial\Omega)} = |\mathcal{K}|. \tag{18}$$

Estimate (18) is obtained by proving that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $u_\varepsilon \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ s.t. $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_\varepsilon = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}$ and

$$\|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq (1+\varepsilon)\|\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = (1+\varepsilon)|\mathcal{K}|. \tag{19}$$

The last estimate is obtained by Theorem 2.16 & Remark 2.17 in [Giu84]. The proof of this result is done for special domains Ω. We sketch its adaptation for a C^2 domain in Appendix C.

With the help of (19), it suffices to use the minimality of u_0 to get (18).

7.2. **Saturation of the upper bound.** In order to have a contradiction we follow the strategy of Spradlin and Tamasan in [ST14]. We fix a sequence $(u_n)_n \subset C^\infty(\Omega)$ defined by the convolution of u_0 and a Friedrichs mollifiers [with compact support]. This sequence of functions is defined in [Giu84]-Theorem 1.17. It satisfies $u_n \overset{BV}{\to} u_0$ and $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_n = \mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_O$.

Here $u_n \overset{BV}{\to} u_0$ means $u_n \overset{L^1}{\to} u_0$ and $\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| \to \int_\Omega |Du_0|$.

For $x \in B_0$ we let

$$V_0(x) = \begin{cases} \nu_{\Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x)} & \text{if } x \in D_0^+ \\ (0,1) & \text{if } x \in D_0^- \end{cases}, \tag{20}$$

and for $N \geq 0$, $x \in B_{N+1}$:

$$V_{N+1}(x) = \begin{cases} V_N(x) & \text{if } x \in B_N \setminus \overset{\circ}{T}{}^{N+1} \\ \nu_{\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}} & \text{if } x \in \overset{\circ}{T}{}_k^{N+1} \end{cases}, \tag{21}$$

where ν_σ is the normal outward of Ω in $\sigma \in \partial\Omega$ and $\nu_{\mathscr{C}_k^{N+1}}$ is defined in Remark 1.1.

We now prove the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *When $N \to \infty$ we may define*

$$\begin{array}{rccc} V_\infty : & B_\infty & \to & \mathbb{R}^2 \\ & x & \mapsto & \lim_{N\to\infty} V_N(x) \end{array}. \tag{22}$$

Moreover, from the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we have:

$$V_N \mathbb{1}_{B_N} \to V_\infty \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty} \text{ in } L^1(\Omega). \tag{23}$$

Proof. Let $x \in B_\infty$. Then $x \in B_N$ for all $N \geq 1$. In order to prove that $V_\infty(x)$ is well defined it suffices to note that, from Remark 4.2, if $x \in \overset{\circ}{T}_{N_0}$ for some $N_0 \geq 1$, then $x \notin T_N$ for $N > N_0$. Consequently, there is a dichotomy:

- $x \in B_\infty \setminus \cup_{N\geq 1} \overset{\circ}{T}_N$,
- $\exists!\, N_0 \geq 1$ s.t. $x \in \overset{\circ}{T}_{N_0}$.

If $x \in B_\infty \setminus \cup_{N\geq 1} \overset{\circ}{T}_N$, then we have $V_N(x) = V_0(x)$ for all $N \geq 1$. Thus $\lim_{N\to\infty} V_N(x) = V_0(x)$. Otherwise there exists a unique $N_0 \geq 1$ s.t. $x \in \overset{\circ}{T}_{N_0}$. Therefore for all $N > N_0$ we have $V_N(x) = V_{N_0}(x)$. Consequently $\lim_{N\to\infty} V_N(x) = V_{N_0}(x)$. □

This section is dedicated for the proof of the lemma:

Lemma 8. *For all $w \in C^\infty \cap BV(\Omega)$ s.t. $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}$ we have*

$$\int_{B_\infty \cap \Omega} |\nabla w \cdot V_\infty| \geq |\mathcal{K}|$$

where V_∞ is the vectorial field defined in (22).

Remark 9. Since $|V_\infty(x)| = 1$ for $x \in B_\infty$, it is clear that Lemma 8 implies that for all n we have

$$\int_{B_\infty \cap \Omega} |\nabla u_n| \geq |\mathcal{K}|.$$

Therefore, from the BV-convergence of u_n to u_0 we get

$$\int_{B_\infty \cap \Omega} |Du_0| \geq |\mathcal{K}|.$$

Section 7.3 is dedicated to a sharper argument than above to get

$$\int_{B_\infty \cap \Omega} |\nabla u_n| \geq \int_{B_\infty \cap \Omega} |\nabla u_n \cdot V_\infty| + \delta$$

with $\delta > 0$ is independent of n. The last estimate will imply $\int_{B_\infty \cap \Omega} |Du_0| \geq |\mathcal{K}| + \delta$ which will be the contradiction in the argumentation.

Proof. We first get that for $w \in C^\infty \cap BV(\Omega)$ s.t. $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}$ we have

$$\int_{B_N \cap \Omega} |\nabla w \cdot V_N| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{K}|}{|\Psi_N|^2_{\mathrm{Lip(B_N)}}} \tag{24}$$

where

$$|\Psi_N|_{\mathrm{Lip(B_N)}} = \sup \left\{ \frac{|\Psi_N(x) - \Psi_N(x)|}{|x-y|} \,|\, x, y \in B_N,\, x \neq y \right\},$$

is the Lipischitz semi-norm of Ψ_N and V_N is the vectorial field defined in (20)&(21).

Once we get this estimate, we claim that for a fixed map $w \in C^\infty \cap BV(\Omega)$ s.t. $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}$, from (23) and the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we have $\nabla w \cdot V_N \mathbb{1}_{B_N \cap \Omega} \to \nabla w \cdot V_\infty \mathbb{1}_{B_\infty \cap \Omega}$ in $L^1(\Omega)$.

Thus, with the help of Lemma 6 $[|\Psi_N|_{\mathrm{Lip(B_N)}} = 1 + o_N(1)]$ we have

$$\int_{B_\infty \cap \Omega} |\nabla w \cdot V_\infty| \geq |\mathcal{K}|.$$

We thus prove (24). We fix $w \in C^\infty \cap BV(\Omega)$ s.t. $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}$. Using the Coarea Formula we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_N|^2_{\mathrm{Lip(B_N)}} \int_{B_N \cap \Omega} |\nabla w \cdot V_N| &\geq \int_{B_N \cap \Omega} |\mathrm{jac}\Psi_N| |\nabla w \cdot V_N| \\ &= \int_{\widehat{AB}} \mathrm{d}\sigma \int_{\Psi_N^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \cap \Omega} |\nabla w \cdot V_N|. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\Psi_N^{-1}(\{\sigma\})$ is a polygonal chain:

$$\Psi_N^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) = I_{\tilde{\sigma}} \cup I^1_{N,\sigma} \cup \cdots \cup I^{N+1}_{N,\sigma}$$

where

- $\tilde{\sigma}$ is s.t. $[AB] \cap \tilde{\Psi}_N^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) = \{\tilde{\sigma}\}$,
- $I_{\tilde{\sigma}}$ is defined in (13),
- for $l = 1, ..., N$ we have $I^l_{N,\sigma} = \Psi_N^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \cap T_{N+1-l}$,
- $I^{N+1}_{N,\sigma} = \Psi_N^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \cap D_N^+$.

From the Fundamental Theorem of calculus and from the definition of V_N, denoting

- $I_{\tilde{\sigma}} = [\alpha_0, \alpha_1]$ (where $\alpha_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and $\alpha_1 = \tilde{\sigma}$),
- $I^l_{N,\sigma} = [\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}]$, $l = 1, ..., N+1$ and $\alpha_{N+2} = \sigma$,

we have for a.e. $\sigma \in \widehat{AB}$:

$$\int_{[\alpha_l, \alpha_{l+1}]} |\nabla w \cdot V_N| \geq |w(\alpha_{l+1}) - w(\alpha_l)|.$$

Here we used a little abuse of notation writing for $l = 0 \& N+2$ $w(\alpha_l)$ instead of $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w(\alpha_l)$.

Therefore for a.e $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_N$ we have

$$\int_{\Psi_N^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \cap \Omega} |\nabla w \cdot V_N| \geq |\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w(\sigma) - \mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} w(\alpha_0)| = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}}(\sigma).$$

We may thus deduce that

$$|\Psi_N|^2_{\mathrm{Lip}(B_N)} \int_{B_N\cap\Omega} |\nabla w \cdot V_N| \quad \geq \quad \int_{\overbrace{AB}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}} = |\mathcal{K}|.$$

The last estimate clearly implies (24) and it ends the proof of Lemma 8. □

7.3. **Transverse argument.** We assumed that there exists a map u_0 which solves Problem (2).

We make the following dichotomy:

- $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus B_\infty$;
- $u_0 \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus B_\infty$.

We are going to prove that both cases give a contradiction.

7.3.1. *The case $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus B_\infty$.* We assume that $\displaystyle\int_{\Omega\setminus B_\infty} |u_0| > 0$. In this case, since $(\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_0)_{|\partial\Omega\setminus\partial B_\infty} \equiv 0$, we have

$$\delta := \int_{\Omega\setminus B_\infty} |Du_0| > 0.$$

Recall that we fixed a sequence $(u_n)_n \subset C^\infty \cap BV(\Omega)$ s.t. $u_n \overset{BV}{\to} u_0$ & $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_n = \mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_0$.

Therefore, for sufficiently large n, we have

$$\int_{\Omega\setminus B_\infty} |\nabla u_n| > \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Thus, from Lemma 8 we get [we use also $|V_\infty(x)| = 1$ for all $x \in B_\infty$]

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| \geq \int_{B_\infty} |\nabla u_n \cdot V_\infty| + \int_{\Omega\setminus B_\infty} |\nabla u_n| \geq |\mathcal{K}| + \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

This implies

$$\int_\Omega |Du_0| = \lim_n \int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| \geq |\mathcal{K}| + \frac{\delta}{2}$$

which is in contradiction with (18).

7.3.2. *The case $u_0 \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus B_\infty$.* We first note that, since $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial D_0^+} u_0 \not\equiv 0$, there exists a triangle $T_k^{N_0}$ s.t. $\int_{T_k^{N_0}} |u_0| > 0$. We fix such a triangle $T_k^{N_0}$ and we let α be its right-angle.

We let $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = (\alpha, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2)$ be the direct orthonormal frame centered in α where $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2 = \nu_{\mathscr{C}_k^{N_0}}$ [$\nu_{\mathscr{C}_k^{N_0}}$ is defined Remark 1.1],*i.e.*, the directions of the new frame are given by the side of the right-angle of $T_k^{N_0}$].

It is clear that for $N \geq N_0$ we have $V_N \equiv \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2$ in $\overset{\circ}{T}{}_k^{N_0}$.

By construction of B_∞, $T_k^{N_0} \cap B_\infty$ is a union of segments directed by $\tilde{e}_2$, *i.e.* $\mathbb{1}_{B_\infty | T_k^{N_0}}(s,t)$ depends only on the first variable "s" in the frame $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$.

Since $\int_{T_k^{N_0}} |u_0| > 0$, in the frame $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, we may find $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t., considering the rectangle (whose sides are parallel to the direction of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$)

$$\mathcal{P} := \{\alpha + s\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 + t\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2 \,|\, (s,t) \in [a,b] \times [c,d]\} \subset T_k^{N_0}$$

we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}} |u_0| > 0.$$

Since from Lemma 5 the set B_∞ has an empty interior [and that $\mathbb{1}_{B_\infty | T_k^{N_0}}(s,t)$ depends only on the first variable in the frame $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$], we may find a', b' s.t.

- $[a', b'] \times [c, d] \subset [a, b] \times [c, d]$,
- $\mathcal{S} \cap B_\infty = \emptyset$ with $\mathcal{S} := \{\alpha + s\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 + t\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2 \,|\, (s,t) \in \{a', b'\} \times [c,d]\}$
- $\delta := \displaystyle\int_{\mathcal{P}'} |u_0| > 0$ with $\mathcal{P}' := \{\alpha + s\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1 + t\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_2 \,|\, (s,t) \in [a', b'] \times [c,d]\}$.

Moreover, since B_∞ is a compact set, we may find an open neighborhood of $\mathcal{S}$ which do not intersect B_∞.

Noting that $u \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus B_\infty$ and that the sequence $(u_n)_n$ is obtained by the convolution of u_0 with a C^∞-mollifier with compact support, it follows that for sufficiently large n we have

- $u_n \equiv 0$ in $\mathcal{S}$,
- $\displaystyle\int_{\mathcal{P}'} |u_n| > \frac{\delta}{2}$.

Consequently, from Lemma 3.2 in [ST14], we get [for sufficiently large n]

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}'} |\partial_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_1} u_n| \geq \frac{2}{b'-a'} \int_{\mathcal{P}'} |u_n| > \frac{\delta}{b'-a'} =: \delta'.$$

Therefore $\int_{\mathcal{P}'} |\partial_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_1} u_n| > \delta'$, $\int_{\mathcal{P}'} |\partial_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_2} u_n| \leq 2|\mathcal{K}|$ and then by Lemma 3.3 in [ST14] we obtain:

$$\int_{\mathcal{P}'} |\nabla u_n| \geq \int_{\mathcal{P}'} |\partial_{\bar{\mathbf{e}}_2} u_n| + \frac{\delta'^2}{4|\mathcal{K}| + \delta'}.$$

Thus, from Lemma 8, for sufficiently large n:

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n| \geq |\mathcal{K}| + \frac{\delta'^2}{4|\mathcal{K}| + \delta'} - o_n(1).$$

From the convergence in BV-norm of u_n to u_0 we have

$$\int_\Omega |Du_0| \geq |\mathcal{K}| + \frac{\delta'^2}{4|\mathcal{K}| + \delta'}.$$

Clearly this last assertion contradicts (18) and ends the proof of Theorem 1.

Appendices

Appendix A. Results related with the Cantor set $\mathcal{K}$

A.1. **Two preliminary results.** We first prove a standard result which states that the length of a *small* chords is a *good* approximation for the length of a curve.

Lemma 10. *Let $0 < \eta < 1$ and let $f \in C^2([0,\eta], \mathbb{R}^+)$. We fix an orthonormal frame and we denote C_f the graph of f in the orthonormal frame. Let $A = (a, f(a)), B = (b, f(b)) \in C_f$ (with $0 \leq a < b \leq \eta$) and let $\mathscr{C} = [AB]$ be the chord of C_f joining A and B. We denote $\widehat{AB}$ the arc of C_f with extremities A and B.*

We have

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}) \leq \mathscr{H}^1(\widehat{AB}) \leq \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}) \left\{1 + (b-a)\|f''\|_{L^\infty}[2\|f'\|_{L^\infty} + \|f''\|_{L^\infty}(b-a)]\right\}.$$

Proof. The estimate $\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}) \leq \mathscr{H}^1(\widehat{AB})$ is standard, we thus prove the second inequality.

On the one hand

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}) = \sqrt{(a-b)^2 + [f(a)-f(b)]^2} = (b-a)\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{f(a)-f(b)}{a-b}\right)^2}.$$

On the other hand

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\widehat{AB}) = \int_a^b \sqrt{1+f'^2}.$$

With the help of the Mean Value Theorem, there is $c \in]a,b[$ s.t.

$$\frac{f(a)-f(b)}{a-b} = f'(c).$$

Applying once again the Mean Value Theorem [to f'], for $x \in [a,b]$ there is c_x between c and x s.t.

$$f'(x) = f'(c) + f''(c_x)(x-c).$$

Consequently for $x \in [a,b]$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{1+f'(x)^2} &= \sqrt{1+[f'(c)+f''(c_x)(x-c)]^2}\\ &= \sqrt{1+f'(c)^2}\sqrt{1+\frac{2f'(c)f''(c_x)(x-c)+f''(c_x)^2(x-c)^2}{1+f'(c)^2}}\\ &\leq \sqrt{1+\left(\frac{f(a)-f(b)}{a-b}\right)^2}\left[1+2\|f'\|_{L^\infty}\|f''\|_{L^\infty}(b-a)+\|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2(b-a)^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{H}^1(\widehat{AB}) &= \int_a^b \sqrt{1+f'(x)^2}\,\mathrm{d}x\\ &\leq (b-a)\sqrt{1+\left(\frac{f(a)-f(b)}{a-b}\right)^2}\left[1+2\|f'\|_{L^\infty}\|f''\|_{L^\infty}(b-a)+\|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2(b-a)^2\right]\\ &= \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C})\left\{1+(b-a)\|f''\|_{L^\infty}[2\|f'\|_{L^\infty}+\|f''\|_{L^\infty}(b-a)]\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

We now state another technical lemma which give an upper bound for the height of the curve w.r.t. its chord.

Lemma 11. *Let $0 \leq a < b \leq \eta$, $f \in C^2([0,\eta],\mathbb{R}^+)$ be a strictly concave function and let C_f be the graph of f in an orthonormal frame. Let $A=(a,f(a))$ and $B=(b,f(b))$ be two points of C_f.*

For $C \in [AB]$ we denote by $\tilde{C}$ the intersection point of C_f with the line orthogonal to $[AB]$ passing by C [from Remark 1.2, $\tilde{C}$ is well defined].

We have

$$\mathscr{H}^1([C\tilde{C}]) \leq (b-a)^2\|f''\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Proof. We first note that if we let $\tilde{x}$ be the abscissa of $\tilde{C}$ and if we let P be the point of $[AB]$ having $\tilde{x}$ for abscissa, then $\mathscr{H}^1([P\tilde{C}]) \geq \mathscr{H}^1([C\tilde{C}])$ since the triangle $CP\tilde{C}$ is right-angled in C.

From the Mean Value Theorem, there exist

- $c_x \in]a,\tilde{x}[$ s.t. $f'(c_x) = \dfrac{f(\tilde{x})-f(a)}{\tilde{x}-a}$
- $c \in]a,b[$ s.t. $f'(c) = \dfrac{f(b)-f(a)}{b-a}$
- $\tilde{c}$ between c and c_x s.t. $f''(\tilde{c}) = \dfrac{f'(c_x)-f'(c)}{c_x-c}$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{H}^1([P\tilde{C}]) &= \left|f(\tilde{x})-\left[(\tilde{x}-a)\frac{f(b)-f(a)}{b-a}+f(a)\right]\right|\\ &= |\tilde{x}-a|\left|\frac{f(\tilde{x})-f(a)}{\tilde{x}-a}-\frac{f(b)-f(a)}{b-a}\right|\\ &= |\tilde{x}-a|\,|f'(c_x)-f'(c)|\\ &= |\tilde{x}-a||c_x-c|\,|f''(\tilde{c})|\\ &\leq (b-a)^2\|f''\|_{L^\infty}\end{aligned}$$

which gives the result. □

A.2. **Proof of Proposition 12.** We prove that

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \mathscr{H}^1(\mathcal{K}_N) > 0. \tag{25}$$

Step 1. We prove that $\max_{k=1,\dots,2^N} \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N) \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^N$

For $N \geq 1$ we let $\{K_k^N \,|\, k=1,\dots,2^N\}$ be the set of the connected components of $\mathcal{K}_N$. We let $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ be the chord of K_k^N and we define $\mu_N = \max_{k=1,\dots,2^N} \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)$. Note that by (10) we have $\mu_0 < 1$.

We first prove that for $N \geq 0$ we have

$$\mu_{N+1} \leq \frac{2}{3}\mu_N. \tag{26}$$

With the help of a standard recursive argument, we may prove that (26) implies [because $\mu_0 < 1$]

$$\mu_N \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^N. \tag{27}$$

In order to get (26), we prove that for $N \geq 1$ and K_k^N a connected component of $\mathcal{K}_N$ and $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ its chord, we have

$$\mathscr{H}^1[\mathscr{C}] \leq \frac{2\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)}{3} \text{ for } \mathscr{C} \in \mathcal{S}(\mathscr{C}_k^N) \tag{28}$$

[see Notations 2 for $\mathcal{S}(\cdot)$, the set of sons of a chord].

Let $N \geq 1$, for $k \in \{1, ..., 2^N\}$ we let K_k^N be a connected component of $\mathcal{K}_N$. We let $K_{2k-1}^{N+1}, K_{2k}^{N+1} \in \mathcal{S}(K_k^N)$ be the curve obtained from K_k^N in the heredity step.

For $\tilde{k} \in \{2k-1, 2k\}$, we let $\mathscr{C}_{\tilde{k}}^{N+1}$ be the chord of $K_{\tilde{k}}^{N+1}$.

In the frame $\mathcal{R}_0$, we may define four points of Γ, $(a_1, f(a_1)), (b_1, f(b_1)), (a_2, f(a_2)), (b_2, f(b_2))$, with $0 < a_1 < b_1 < a_2 < b_2 < \eta$ s.t.:

- the extremities of K_{2k-1}^{N+1} are $(a_1, f(a_1))\&(b_1, f(b_1))$;
- the extremities of K_{2k}^{N+1} are $(a_2, f(a_2))\&(b_2, f(b_2))$;
- the extremities of K_k^N are $(a_1, f(a_1))\&(b_2, f(b_2))$.

In the frame $\mathcal{R}_0$ we let also $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2)$ be the coordinates of the points of $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ s.t. for $l \in \{1, 2\}$, the triangles whose vertices are $\{(a_l, f(a_l)); (b_l, f(b_l)); (\alpha_l, \beta_l)\}$ are right angled in (α_l, β_l).

We denote

- $\mathcal{I}_1$ the segment $[(b_1, f(b_1)); (\alpha_1, \beta_1)]$;
- $\mathcal{I}_2$ the segment $[(a_2, f(a_2)); (\alpha_2, \beta_2)]$.

From the construction of $K_{2k-1}^{N+1}\&K_{2k}^{N+1}$ and from Pythagore theorem we have for $l = 1, 2$

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_{2k-2+l}^{N+1})^2 = \mathscr{H}^1(\mathcal{I}_l)^2 + \left(\frac{\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N) - \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)^2}{2}\right)^2.$$

Using Lemma 11 we get that

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\mathcal{I}_l) \leq (b_2 - a_1)^2 \|f''\|_{L^\infty}.$$

On the other hand we have obviously $b_2 - a_1 \leq \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)$. Consequently we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_{2k-2+l}^{N+1})^2 &\leq \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)^4 \|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \left(\frac{\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N) - \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)^2}{2}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)^4 \|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \frac{\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)^2}{4}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_{2k-2+l}^{N+1}) \leq \frac{\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)}{2}\sqrt{1 + 4\|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2 \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)^2},$$

thus using (11) we get

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_{2k-2+l}^{N+1}) \leq \frac{2\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)}{3}.$$

The last estimate gives (28) and thus (27) holds.

Step 2. We prove that $\liminf_{N\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{2^N} \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N) > 0$

For $N \geq 1$, we let

$$c_N = \sum_{k=1}^{2^N} \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N).$$

The main ingredient in this step consists in noting that, a son of $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ is an hypothenuse of a right angled triangle which admits a side with length $\dfrac{\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N) - \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)^2}{2}$.

Consequently we have

$$\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_{2k-1}^{N+1}) + \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_{2k}^{N+1}) \geq \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N) - \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)^2.$$

Thus, summing the previous inequality for $k = 1, ..., 2^N$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} c_{N+1} &= \sum_{k=1}^{2^N} \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_{2k-1}^{N+1}) + \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_{2k}^{N+1}) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{2^N} \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)[1 - \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)] \\ &\geq c_N(1 - \mu_N) \\ &\geq c_N \left[1 - \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^N\right]. \end{aligned}$$

By a standard recursive argument we obtain for $N \geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} c_N &\geq c_1 \prod_{k=1}^{N-1} \left[1 - \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^k\right] \\ &= c_1 \times \exp\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \ln\left[1 - \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^k\right]\right]. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $\liminf_N \sum_{l=1}^{N-1} \ln\left[1 - \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^k\right] > -\infty$, thus $\liminf_N c_N > 0$.

Step 3. We prove (25).

Since for K_k^N, a connected component of $\mathcal{K}_N$, and $\mathscr{C}_k^N$ its chord, we have $\mathscr{H}^1(K_k^N) \geq \mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}_k^N)$, from Step 2 we get (25).

Appendix B. Results related with the set B_∞

In this section we use the notations of Section 4.

Proposition 12. *Let $\gamma \subset \widehat{AB}$ be a curve and let $\mathscr{C}$ be its chord. We let γ_1, γ_2 be the curves included in γ obtained by the heredity construction represented Figure 1 [section 4.2]. For $l = 1, 2$, we denote also by $\mathscr{C}_l$ the chord of γ_l and by T_l the right-angled triangle having $\mathscr{C}_l$ as side of the right-angle and having its hypothenuse included in $\mathscr{C}$.*

If $\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C}) < (4\|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2)^{-2}$, then the hypothenuses of the triangles T_1 and T_2 have their length strictly lower than $\dfrac{\mathscr{H}^1(\mathscr{C})}{2}$. And in particular the triangles T_1 and T_2 are disjoint.

Proof. We model the statement by denoting M and Q the extremities of γ and N and P are points s.t.:

- M, N are the extremities of γ_1
- P, Q are the extremities of γ_2.

We denote $\delta = \mathscr{H}^1([MQ])$.

We fix an orthonormal frame $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ with the origin in M, with the x-axe (MQ) and s.t. N, P, Q have respectively for coordinates (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) and $(x_3, 0)$ where $0 < x_1 < x_2 < x_3$ and $y_1, y_2 > 0$.

By construction we have

$$x_1 = \frac{\delta - \delta^2}{2},\ x_2 = \frac{\delta + \delta^2}{2} \text{ and } x_3 = \delta.$$

Moreover, from Lemma 11 we have [recall that $\widehat{AB}$ is the graph of a function f in an other orthonormal frame]:

$$0 < y_1, y_2 \leq \delta^2 \|f''\|_{L^\infty}.$$




FIGURE 6. Modelisation of the situation

From these points, in Section 4.2, we defined two right-angled triangles having their hypothenuses included in the x-axes.

The first triangle admits for vertices the origin $(0,0)$, (x_1, y_1) and a point of the x-axis $(x_4, 0)$. This triangle is right angled in (x_1, y_1). In the frame $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, one of the side of the right-angle is included in the line parametrized by the cartesian equation $y = ax$. Since $\delta \leq 1/2$

$$|a| = \left|\frac{y_1}{x_1}\right| \leq \frac{2\delta^2 \|f''\|_{L^\infty}}{\delta - \delta^2} \leq 4\|f''\|_{L^\infty}\delta.$$

The second triangle admits for vertices (x_2, y_2), $(x_3, 0)$ and a point of the x-axes $(x_5, 0)$. This triangle is right-angled in (x_2, y_2). In the frame $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$, one of the side of the right-angle is included in the line parametrized by the cartesian equation $y = \alpha x + \beta$ where

$$|\alpha| = \left|\frac{y_2}{x_2 - x_3}\right| \leq \frac{2\delta^2 \|f''\|_{L^\infty}}{\delta - \delta^2} \leq 4\|f''\|_{L^\infty}\delta.$$

The proof of the proposition consists in obtaining

$$x_4 < \frac{x_3}{2} \text{ and } x_3 - x_5 < \frac{x_3}{2}.$$

We get the first estimate. With the help of Pythagore Theorem we have

$$x_1^2 + y_1^2 + (x_1 - x_4)^2 + y_1^2 = x_4^2.$$

By noting that $y_1 = ax_1$ we have

$$x_4 = (1 + a^2)x_1.$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} x_4 < \frac{x_3}{2} &\iff (1+a^2)\frac{\delta - \delta^2}{2} < \frac{\delta}{2} \\ &\impliedby (1 + 16\|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2\delta^2)(1-\delta) < 1 \\ &\iff \delta - \delta^2 < \frac{1}{16\|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2} \\ &\impliedby \delta < \frac{1}{16\|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Following the same strategy we get that if $\delta < \dfrac{1}{16\|f''\|_{L^\infty}^2}$ then $x_3 - x_5 < \dfrac{x_3}{2}$. □

APPENDIX C. ADAPTATION OF A RESULT OF GIUSTI IN [Giu84]

In this appendix we present briefly the proof of Theorem 2.16&Remark 2.17 in [Giu84]. The argument we present below follows the proof of Theorem 2.15 in [Giu84].

Proposition 13. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open set of class C^2 and let $h \in L^1(\partial\Omega)$. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $u_\varepsilon \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ s.t. $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega} u_\varepsilon = h$ and*

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,1}(\Omega)} := \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq (1+\varepsilon)\|h\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Proof. We sketch the proof of Proposition 13. Let $h \in L^1(\partial\Omega)$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be sufficiently small s.t.

$$(1+\varepsilon^2)^2 + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^4 < 1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{ and } (1+\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2 < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

.

Step 1. We may consider $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small s.t. in $\Omega_\eta := \{x \in \Omega \,|\, \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) < \eta\}$ we have:

(1) The function

$$\begin{array}{rccc} d: & \Omega_\eta & \to &]0,\eta[\\ & x & \mapsto & \mathrm{dist}(x,\partial\Omega) \end{array}$$

is of class C^2 and satisfy $|\nabla d| \geq 1/2$.

(2) The orthogonal projection on $\partial\Omega$, $\Pi_{\partial\Omega}$, is Lipschitz.

We now fix a sequence $(h_k)_k \subset C^\infty(\partial\Omega)$ s.t. $h_k \overset{L^1}{\to} h$. We may assume that (up to replace the first term and to consider an extraction):

(1) $h_0 \equiv 0$

(2) $\sum_{k\geq 0} \|h_{k+1} - h_k\|_{L^1} \leq (1+\varepsilon^2)\|h\|_{L^1}$.

And finally we fix a decreasing sequence $(t_k)_k \subset \mathbb{R}_+^*$ s.t.

(1) $t_0 < \min(\eta, \varepsilon^2)$ is sufficiently small s.t.

- $4t_0 \max(1; \|\nabla\Pi_{\partial\Omega}\|_{L^\infty}) \times \max(1, \sup_k \|h_k\|_{L^1}) < \min(\varepsilon^2, \varepsilon^2\|h\|_{L^1})$,
- for $\varphi \in L^1(\partial\Omega)$ we have for $s \in]0, t_0[$

$$\int_{d^{-1}(\{s\})} |\varphi \circ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x)| \leq (1+\varepsilon^2)\int_{\partial\Omega} |\varphi(x)|.$$

(2) For $k \geq 1$ we have $t_k \leq \dfrac{t_0\|h\|_{L^1}}{2^k(1 + \|\nabla h_k\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla h_{k+1}\|_{L^\infty})}$.

Step 2. We define

$$\begin{array}{rccc} u_\varepsilon: & \Omega & \to & \mathbb{R} \\ & x & \mapsto & \begin{cases} \dfrac{d(x)-t_{k+1}}{t_k - t_{k+1}} h_k \circ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) + \dfrac{t_k - d(x)}{t_k - t_{k+1}} h_{k+1} \circ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) & \text{if } d(x) \in [t_{k+1}, t_k[\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} . \end{array}$$

We may easily check that u_ε is locally Lipschitz and thus weakly differentiable.

From the coarea formula and a standard change of variable we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^1} &\leq 2\int_{\{d\leq t_0\}} |u_\varepsilon||\nabla d|\mathrm{d}x \\ &= 2\int_0^{t_0}\int_{d^{-1}(\{s\})} |u_\varepsilon|\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq 2\sum_{k\geq 0}\int_{t_{k+1}}^{t_k}\mathrm{d}s\int_{d^{-1}(\{s\})} |u_\varepsilon|\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq 2\sum_{k\geq 0}\int_{t_{k+1}}^{t_k}\mathrm{d}s\int_{d^{-1}(\{s\})} [|h_k\circ\Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x)| + |h_{k+1}\circ\Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x)|]\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq 2(1+\varepsilon^2)\sum_{k\geq 0}\int_{t_{k+1}}^{t_k}\mathrm{d}s\int_{\partial\Omega} [|h_k(x)| + |h_{k+1}(x)|]\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq 2(1+\varepsilon^2)\sum_{k\geq 0}(t_k - t_{k+1})(\|h_k\|_{L^1} + \|h_{k+1}\|_{L^1}) \\ &\leq 4(1+\varepsilon^2)t_0 \sup_k \|h_k\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq (1+\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2\|h\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\|h\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate $\|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^1}$. It is easy to check that if $d(x) \in]t_{k+1}, t_k[$ then we have

$$|\nabla u_\varepsilon(x)| \leq |\nabla d(x)| \left[\frac{|h_k \circ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) - h_{k+1} \circ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x)|}{t_k - t_{k+1}} + 2\|\nabla \Pi_{\partial\Omega}\|_{L^\infty} \left[|\nabla h_k| \circ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) + |\nabla h_{k+1}| \circ \Pi_{\partial\Omega}(x) \right] \right].$$

Consequently we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^1} &\leq (1+\varepsilon^2) \sum_{k\geq 0} \left\{ \int_{t_{k+1}}^{t_k} \frac{\|h_{k+1} - h_k\|_{L^1}}{t_k - t_{k+1}} + 2\|\nabla \Pi_{\partial\Omega}\|_{L^\infty} (t_k - t_{k+1}) (\|\nabla h_{k+1}\|_{L^1} + \|\nabla h_k\|_{L^1}) \right\} \\
&\leq (1+\varepsilon^2)[(1+\varepsilon^2)\|h\|_{L^1} + 2\|\nabla \Pi_{\partial\Omega}\|_{L^\infty} t_0 \|h\|_{L^1}] \\
&\leq (1+\varepsilon^2)[(1+\varepsilon^2) + \varepsilon^2]\|h\|_{L^1} \\
&\leq (1+\varepsilon/2)\|h\|_{L^1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently $u_\varepsilon \in W^{1,1}(\Omega)$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{W^{1,1}} \leq (1+\varepsilon)\|h\|_{L^1}$.

In order to end the proof it suffices to check that $\mathrm{tr}_{\partial\Omega}(u_\varepsilon) = h$. The justification of this property follows the argument of Lemma 2.4 in [Giu84]. □

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Petru Mironescu for fruitful discussions.

References

[Gag57] E. Gagliardo, *Caratterizzazioni delle tracce sulla frontiera relative ad alcune classi di funzioni in n variabili*, Rendiconti del seminario matematico della università di Padova **27** (1957), 284–305.

[Giu84] E. Giusti, *Minimal surfaces and functions of bounded variation*, no. 80, Springer Science & Business Media, 1984.

[Mir15] P. Mironescu, *Note on Gagliardo's theorem "* $\mathrm{tr}\, W^{1,1} = L^1$*"*, Annals of the University of Bucharest (mathematical series) **6 (LXIV)** (2015), no. 1, 99–103.

[ST14] G. Spradlin and A. Tamasan, *Not all traces on the circle come from functions of least gradient in the disk*, Indiana University Mathematics Journal **63** (2014), no. 3, 1819–1837.

[SWZ92] P. Sternberg, G. Williams, and W. Ziemer, *Existence, uniqueness, and regularity for functions of least gradient.*, Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik **430** (1992), 35–60.

M. Dos Santos, Université Paris Est-Créteil, 61 avenue du Général de Gaulle, 94010 Créteil Cedex,
E-mail address: mickael.dos-santos@u-pec.fr